

RESOLUTIONS

4 & 5. Grant of further Constitutional Reforms—(cont.)

4. *As a further step towards complete responsible government this Council recommends to the Government to place the Departments of Education, Medicine and Public Works under popular Ministers (Mr. T. K. Nayar).*

5. *This Council recommends to the Government that they may be pleased to make an immediate announcement establishing full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja (Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar).*

Dr. A. R. Menon (Minister for Rural Development): Sir, I have been speaking on this resolution towards the end of the last meeting. I shall just read the resolutions. "As a further step towards complete responsible government, this Council recommends to Government to place the Departments of Education, Medicine and Public Works under popular Ministers." The two following resolutions recommend to the Government, the first on the introduction of full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja and the second one is that they may be pleased to make an immediate announcement establishing full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja.

Now, Sir, there is no difference of opinion as to whether full responsible government is to be conceded or not. All are agreed on it. Therefore that question does not arise at all. But the question centres round this one cardinal fact, whether a partial step, a half way house should be reached by accepting Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution or we must press forward without respite, to the goal of full responsible government all at once. There is certainly a difference of opinion between these two schools of thought and that is the reason why instead of accepting the latter alternative or the second resolution mainly that full responsible government should be conferred immediately, I prefer to follow the 1st course. I wish to state a few reasons for the attitude that I am taking on this question. I have already referred during the discussion in the last meeting that certain requisite qualifications for a full democratic system of government are necessary to be fulfilled if we want to work these institutions in a proper manner. I have said that it is essential for the introduction of this system of government that there must be a reasonable level of general education so that the voters who become the masters of the situation will be in a position to understand and realise the

value of the vote. It is essential that a high level of education, as I said, must be achieved by the people before they could work out this most difficult system of government. Not only that, along with it there must be a spirit of tolerance and a capacity for compromise—essential conditions for the fulfilment of the requirements for establishing a system of government of this kind. Further, there must be the largest measure of unity of opinion so that this system of government may be carried on because this system is not based upon force but upon the consensus of opinion of the people essentially necessary. But I submit that these high qualities can be achieved only in gradual stages. There is no country in the history of the world where full democratic system of government introduced forthwith survived the test for even 25 years. Take contemporary instances of our own life-time and read the lesson that those instances can teach us. A system of government by the people was introduced in Russia after the war. Gradually it became a dictatorship of the proletariat. I am not here to discuss whether it is an advantage or a disadvantage, whether the system of government known as Bolshevism is good or bad. I am not going to offer any remarks on it. But I am only saying that the full responsible government turned into a dictatorship of a section of the population. Similarly in Germany after the last war a republic was established. What was the fate of that republic within the small span of 25 years? The republic was destroyed and a system of government was introduced, a kind of government which strikes terror and spreads destruction all over Europe. Is there any similarity between the Nazism existing today and the republic established after the war?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (*Nemmara*): How are they in power now? Is it by the vote of the people?

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): That is not the point. I am asking, how do we know that it is the will of the people. This is only one man's rule. There is only Hitler.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (*Nemmara*): How is Hitler in power?

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): By the strength of his arms.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (*Nemmara*): By the strength of votes.

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): I can manipulate votes. If you do not vote as I direct, your heads will be knocked off. That is the position there.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (*Nemmara*): That is another matter.

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): It is essential that a preparatory course of training is necessary for the successful establishment and functioning of full democratic system of government. Whatever be the system of government of a country the success or failure of that system depends to a very great extent upon the essential qualities of the people. If you refer to the constitutional history—I am not a student of history myself—you will find that before the war the Italian Parliament in theory was absolutely supreme whereas the German Reichstag was only an advisory body. But in reality the German Parliament used to exercise greater influence and greater power of control over the executive than the Italian Parliament, theoretically a sovereign body, was able to do. I discern from this a lesson that the success or failure depended upon the stamina, energy and public spirit of the people. Thus this system of government requires various qualities and qualifications and, certainly not the least important, a thorough training in this difficult system of government. Therefore, Mr. T. K. Nayar wisely says, "Very well, you have introduced this system. A part of the Government is handed over to a Minister. Why not introduce another Minister or Ministers and hand over some more of these departments to his control?"

Mr. M. K. Devassy (*Adur*): Do you mean that Cochin is not ripe for full responsible government?

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): Everyone can form his own opinion.

Mr. M. K. Devassy (*Adur*): I only wanted to ascertain your opinion clearly.

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): Therefore, the question is, even granting that we are possessed of all essential qualities necessary, even conceding that we are in a position to claim all the essential qualities and characteristics necessary to run this system of government, is there any harm in taking a part of it and giving a fair trial and gradually going to the next step? Does anyone in this House say that 4 or 6 years in the life-time of a nation is a long period?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (*Nemmara*): Is 600 long?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon (*Mulakunnathukavu*): Is 6,000 long?

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): If you think that 6 and 600 are the same I have no quarrel. Generally it will be conceded that in all national development and national

evolution, a period of three or six years is not considered to be a very long period. Sir, I feel, even now with a little tolerance the history of this poor country—the whole of India—would have been differently written than it is written today. That is my personal view. As I have pointed out, a period of 6 or 7 years is not such a long period. I want the House to take the road which is beset with lesser difficulties. Do you not realise that there are difficulties standing in the way of even the best intentioned administrator? There are certain aspects of this question which cannot even be discussed in this House. Is it not our duty to realise all these difficulties and also realise the position that we occupy in relation to the whole of this sub-continent. Should we not offer such a suggestion that could be accepted and for which there is the greatest unanimity of opinion so that we may at least take a full and vigorous step in the direction of the achievement of complete self-governing institutions? These are the questions that we have to consider. I have not the least quarrel with anyone who advocates the other thing. I am only saying this as a matter of caution, and believe me, with the best of intentions and with the greatest sense of responsibility, something tells me that if this moderate course is followed, something tangible will take place within a limited period of time. If it be so, is it not our duty unanimously to present a proposition which has the largest amount of agreement in this House, a proposition which can be taken up without very great difficulties? That is the way I want you, gentlemen, to look at this matter.

I want also the House to realise the situation in which we find ourselves and I want you to think, is it not the most propitious time for the House to strike a moderate tone so that we may achieve the end in view? What is the position? I will just read one small passage from the speech delivered by an eminent lawyer, not a foolish non-lawyer. "The wide powers given to the Diwan (that is the Diwan of Cochin under section 5 of the Cochin Constitution and the latitude given to the elected members even though only over a limited field of administration demonstrated that the Maharaja of Cochin has ceased to be an *autocratic monarch*". That is the opinion of a legal luminary, to which you must give proper weight.

You must attach proper weight to that statement. Now Sir, a Maharaja of a royal family, who has been ruling autocratically for generations is willing to surrender the autocratic power without any hesitation whatsoever when the people wanted it. Therefore it may be considered that the moment those who constitute the political and legal advisers of His Highness the Maharaja decide to take a step

further, we may assume that there will not be any opposition whatsoever from the Ruler himself. And who is the person to advise him? The man really responsible to advise him is the present Diwan whose life blood is public life and who is ever anxious to build up a reputation for having made an attempt to solve the most difficult problem affecting British India and Indian States.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan (*Ezhuvas-Talappalli*): Make hay when the sun shines.

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): Therefore, there would be no opposition from such a Diwan who has his own reputation at stake. That reputation is enhanced by the successful working of this reform which he had the courage to introduce in an Indian State. Now, has this change produced any unpleasant reverberations in this State? Nothing. Immediately officials were able to adapt themselves to the changed conditions and without the least difference between the Diwan and the Minister they began to execute their work absolutely impartially and carry out orders with the same vigilance and quickness and with the same loyalty as they had been doing in the past.

Then we have got a population which gradually is coming together, forgetting communal differences and religious animosities. Gradually, these unpleasant things are being eliminated and we are becoming a homogenous body so far as political matters are concerned. It is an essential condition that the population must be homogenous from a political point of view, with party divisions of course. Then only this system can be well worked. We have now divided into 2 or 3 parties. There are certain main principles which are common to all the 3 parties, but there is no clear line of demarcation as far as I have been able to gather between the various parties, so much so 2 super-politicians of Trichur lately thought that all these 3 parties must be scraped away and those two great men are going to introduce a fourth party to suppress, annihilate and supersede these 3 parties.

Mr. K. V. Menon (*Publicity Officer*): They have already formed a party.

Dr. A. R. Menon (*Minister for Rural Development*): This indicates that the parties are in a fluid state and have had yet no time to solidify and take proper shapes. Unless there are well defined parties you cannot work a democratic system of government on parliamentary lines. There is no doubt about it. There must be a real opposition. Unless there is a real opposition, there cannot be a properly democratic system of government on efficient lines. The

political education has not yet advanced to that extent as to make us divide into two sections of well defined principles so that when one party is assuming the charge of administration, the other party may hold out promise to the people that with a turn of the wheel, when the opposition comes, certain things which the present ministry is not willing or cannot do, will be done by them. That is the way the democratic system of Government is being carried on. We have not advanced to that stage necessary to work this system to the fullest extent. But all the same as I said within these 3 or 4 years great changes have come over our people and with the extension of power to them still greater changes may take place. As I said, now-a-days, parties are not divided on communal lines or on sectarian grounds which is a great advance in the history of this State, and I have no doubt within another 3 or 4 years further progress will be made and we will be able to form parties on proper and recognised lines so that the voter may know what each party stands for. We should also have a system of government having an efficient opposition to control and criticise the ministry's actions. These conditions may take some time and Mr. T. K. Nayar wisely has chosen 3 departments which would not create any inconvenience for the time being, all the inconvenience being shoved on the reserved half. I am asking in all earnestness what is the objection in accepting Mr. T. K. Nayar's proposition and waiting for a period of 2 or 3 years more.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (Nemmara): After 3 years, can you guarantee the introduction of full responsible government?

Dr. A. R. Menon (Minister for Rural Development): Nobody can guarantee. Shall I be here for 3 or 4 years? My own existence cannot be guaranteed for 3 years. I say tomorrow the sun will be here again. It is reasonable to presume on a process of reasoning that tomorrow the sun will again rise. Similarly once a step is taken, for better or for worse, in the direction of democratic system of government—popular representative Government—I cannot for a moment imagine that any Government will try to scrape this and revert to the old system of autocratic government.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): We may not be sure.

Dr. A. R. Menon (Minister for Rural Development): I do not think so. That is all I can say. It must proceed further. And Mr. T. K. Nayar says, "hasten slowly." That is all he says. I think on a full consideration of this aspect, it will be found to be a sound policy—policy is necessary in such matters—it will be a tactful method to present a *uniform opinion* of this House for a further extension of the reforms. These are the reasons, hon'ble members, why I feel inclined wholeheartedly to support Mr. T. K. Nayar's

proposition, and to remain neutral with regard to Mr. Subramania Ayyar's resolution.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): Why neutral? You can as well oppose.

Dr. A. R. Menon (Minister for Rural Development): I do not want to oppose. The principle is alright. But the difficulty is, as I said, to bring idealism and realism to approach as near as possible. I believe the practicability lies more in the proposition enunciated by Mr. T. K. Nayar and I am willing and very much pleased to support that proposition.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. ആർ. വിശ്വംഭരൻ : സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട നെമ്മാറ മെമ്പർമാർക്കും അവതരിപ്പിച്ച പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വ ഭരണത്തെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള പ്രമേയത്തെയാണ് ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നത്. സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കോൺഗ്രസ്സ് പാർട്ടി നേതാവിന്റെ പരിമിതമായ പ്രമേയത്തോടു യോജിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാതെ വന്നിരിക്കുന്നതിന്റെ കാരണങ്ങൾ ഈ പാർട്ടിയിൽ നിന്നു ഇതിനുമുമ്പു തന്നെ പല ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാരും പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. പക്ഷെ അതിയാഞ്ഞിട്ടും അഥവാ അറിഞ്ഞിട്ടും മനഃപൂർവ്വം അറിഞ്ഞില്ലെന്നു നടിച്ചൊ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രിയെപ്പോലെയുള്ള ആളുകൾ ഇവിടെ ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണസ്ഥാപനത്തിന്നു വേണ്ടി ചെയ്യുന്ന പരിശ്രമങ്ങൾക്കുപോലും ആണിതറയ്ക്കുന്ന വിധത്തിലുള്ള പ്രസ്താവനകൾ ചെയ്യുമ്പോൾ അതിന് സമുചിതമായ മറുപടി പറയേണ്ടത് ആവശ്യമായിത്തീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഹൈന്ദവപുരാണങ്ങളിൽ ഒരു അസുരന്റെ കഥ ഞാൻ കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. അയാളുടെ ചുണ്ടുവിരൽകൊണ്ടുതൊടുന്ന ആർ ഭയ്യമാകുമെന്നു പരമശിവൻ വരുകൊടുത്തുവെന്നും ഒടുവിൽ അയാളുടെ ചുണ്ടുവിരൽ അയാളുടെ ശിരസ്സിൽതന്നെ തൊടുകയും അങ്ങിനെ ആ കരം അയാളുടെ നാശത്തിനുതന്നെ ഹേതുവാകയും ചെയ്തുവെന്നും ഒരു കഥയുണ്ട്. ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ ഇതിനുമുമ്പ് അനേകകാലം നടത്തിട്ടുള്ള ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണത്തിന്റെ ഫലമായി നമ്മൾക്കു ലഭിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള മന്ത്രി അവർക്കും ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണത്തിന്റെ മൂലതത്വത്തെപ്പോലും അവഹേളിക്കാത്ത ഒരു പ്രസ്താവന ചെയ്തിനെക്കുറിച്ച് നമ്മൾ ചിന്തിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിലെ രാഷ്ട്രീയ ചരിത്രത്തിൽ ഏറ്റവും ദാരുണമായ ഒരു ഭാഗം ആണ് ഇന്നു കൊച്ചിയിലെ ജനകീയമന്ത്രി അവർക്കും അഭിനയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്. അദ്ദേഹം രെഖിലലോകരാഷ്ട്രീയവിഭാഗന്റെ നിലയിൽ കൊച്ചിയിലെ ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണതത്വങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ച് ഒരുപദേശം നൽകിയിരിക്കുന്നു. വിദ്യാഭ്യാസപരമായി രാജ്യത്തിനു ഔന്നത്യമുണ്ടായിരിക്കണം, സമുദായസഹിഷ്ണുത ജനങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടായിരിക്കണം, രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ മൗലികകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ എല്ലാവർക്കും ഏകാഭിപ്രായമുണ്ടായിരിക്കണം എന്നിങ്ങിനെയാണ് ആ രാഷ്ട്രീയകാർഷിഖാമണി ഉപദേശംനൽകുന്നത്. ബ്രിട്ടീഷുപാർലിമെൻറിൽ ഇൻഡ്യയുടെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള വാദപ്രതിവാദാവസരത്തിൽ മിസ്റ്റർ ആർ. ആണോ ഇവിടെ പ്രസംഗിക്കുന്നതെന്നുപോലും ഞാൻ സംശയിച്ചുപോയി. ഇൻഡ്യാക്കാക്കു പരിപൂർണ്ണസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം കൊടുക്കണമെങ്കിൽ അവിടെ ജാതീയമായ അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസം ഇല്ലാതാകണം, ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഭരണവിഷയങ്ങളിൽ പരിചയംവേണം എന്നൊക്കെ പാർലിമെണ്ടിൽ പറഞ്ഞുകേൾക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ഇവിടത്തെ ഭരണം നടത്തുന്ന ആളുകൾ എല്ലാം നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിൽ ജനിച്ച ആളുകളും നമ്മളെപ്പോലെയുള്ള ആളുകളും ആണെന്നു അറിയാവുന്നതാണ്. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഗവണ്മെണ്ടു

സെക്രട്ടറിയും അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ സഹചരന്മാരും ഒക്കെ ഞങ്ങളെപ്പോലെയുള്ള ആളുകൾ അല്ലെ? ഇവർ ആകാശത്തിൽനിന്നു പൊട്ടിവിണവരാണെന്നു വിചാരിക്കാൻ ന്യായമുണ്ടോ? ഈ കാര്യങ്ങൾ നോക്കുമ്പോൾ—ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി അവർകൾ നിവൃത്തിയുള്ള കാര്യങ്ങൾകൊണ്ടുതന്നെ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനു്ക്കു അർഹത കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തിനുണ്ടെന്നുബോദ്ധ്യമാകുന്നതാണ്. എന്തിനു ധൃതിപ്പെടുന്നു; സാവധാനത്തിൽമതി എന്നാണ് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രിയുടേയും അദ്ദേഹത്തെപ്പോലെ ചിന്തിക്കാൻ ശക്തിയുള്ളവരുടേയും സാമാധാനം.

എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളത് ഈ ദിനഭരണംകൊണ്ടു—ഇപ്പോൾ നിലവിലിരിക്കുന്ന ഭരണസമ്പ്രദായംകൊണ്ടു—ചില ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകൾ മന്ത്രിയുടെ കീഴിലും, മററുചില ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകൾ നിയമസഭയോടു് ഉത്തരവാദിത്വമില്ലാത്ത ഒരു ഭാഗക്കാരുടെ കയ്യിലും ഇരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടാണ് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി അവർകൾതന്നെ ഇങ്ങിനെ റിസർവ്ഡ് പക്ഷത്തിന്റെ അടിപണിയുന്നതിനും രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ മൗലികതത്വങ്ങളിൽ കോടാലിവെക്കുന്നതിനും ഇടയായത് എന്നാണ്. ഈ രാജ്യത്തിലെ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ പണം പിരിക്കുന്നതിനും ചിലവുചെയ്യുന്നതിനും ഉള്ള അധികാരം ചില കൂട്ടക്കു തിരിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുകയും, അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള അധികാരങ്ങൾ ഒന്നും ഇല്ലാത്ത ചില ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകൾ ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണത്തിനായി നീക്കിവെയ്ക്കുകയും ചെയ്താൽ ഞങ്ങളുടെ മന്ത്രിമാർ മററുള്ളവരുടെ ദാസന്മാരായി കഴിയേണ്ടിവരും എന്നുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടാണ് പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം അല്ലാതെ ഇൻസ്റ്റാൾമെന്റായി ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണ്ടെന്നുപറയുന്നത്. കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിന്റെ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിന്റെ പരിത്രത്തിൽ എറ്റവും ദയനീയമായ ഒരു രംഗമാണ് ഇവിടെ അഭിനയിച്ചത്. ജനങ്ങൾ തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്ത ഒരു മന്ത്രിതന്നെ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം സാവധാനത്തിൽ മതി എന്നു പറയുന്നത് വാസ്തവത്തിൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വത്തെയും ധർമ്മത്തെയും മറന്നുകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു പ്രസ്താവിക്കാതെ തരമില്ല. പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം കൊണ്ടല്ലാതെ, ഈ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ എല്ലാവകുപ്പുകളും ജനങ്ങളുടെ കയ്യിൽ വന്നല്ലാതെ ഈ രാജ്യത്തിൽ യഥാർത്ഥ പരിഷ്കാരം പ്രാപിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ അനേകകോടി ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഇന്നത്തെ ദാരുണമായ അവസ്ഥയിൽ മുതലക്കണ്ണിൻ വാക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു, കൊച്ചിയിലെ സ്ഥിതി ഇതിൽനിന്നു വിഭിന്നമാണോ എന്ന്. ഇവിടെ സമാധാനം പരിപാലിച്ചുവരുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു അദ്ദേഹം പറയുമായിരിക്കും. എന്നാൽ എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളത് ഇവിടത്തെ സമാധാനം മുടലക്കുളത്തിലെ സമാധാനമാണെന്നാണ്. ഈ രാജ്യത്തിൽ ശരിയായ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യവും സമാധാനവും കിട്ടാൻ ഇനിയും പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. അതിനു പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണം കൊണ്ടല്ലാതെ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ലെന്നും ഇതുപോലെ ഇൻസ്റ്റാൾമെന്റ് ഭരണരീതി നമ്മളെ അടിതെറ്റിക്കുമെന്നും ഈ സഭ മനസ്സിലാക്കണമെന്നു കൊച്ചിയിലെ മഹലക്ഷം ജനങ്ങളുടെ പേരിൽ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി, ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ പാവങ്ങളുടെ പേരിൽ പറഞ്ഞപ്പോലെ, ഞാനും ഈ നിയമസഭയോടുകൂടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. പൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണംകൊണ്ടല്ലാതെ ഇൻസ്റ്റാൾമെന്റ് ഭരണംകൊണ്ടു് കൊച്ചിയിലെ ജനങ്ങൾ ഒരിക്കലും തൃപ്തിപ്പെടുകയില്ലെന്നുള്ള ഈ രാജ്യത്തിലെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായത്തെ ഞാൻ ഈ സഭയിൽ വ്യക്തമാക്കിക്കൊള്ളുന്നു.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (Secretary to Government):
Mr. President Sir, I desire to state a few words on this very important resolution or resolutions on behalf of the Government. The subject

59539

GRANT OF FURTHER CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS

501

whether put forward in the modified or diplomatic manner in which it is put forward by the hon'ble member Mr. T. K. Nayar or the expansive or idealistic way in which it has been couched in the other resolutions, is not new either to this House or to the Government. It has come up either in the amended or in the original form on several occasions on the floor of this House. And on one occasion, i.e., in 1114, a statement by my predecessor in office has very carefully and succinctly put forward the position of the Government with respect to this resolution. The statement then read out to the Council by the then Secretary to Government was further amplified and further elaborated upon by the Diwan-President who followed. I am referring to the Legislative Session of 1114. Really there is very little for me to add to this considered and elaborate pronouncement made by the Government.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon (*Chittur-Rural*): Then you have not progressed.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): We have progressed to the same extent as you have progressed. These resolutions were discussed even then. These are nothing new. Even in 1114 you made the demand. When that demand was made we took into consideration even its idealistic form. We made a considered statement then. So we can imagine we are sitting in 1114. You have not added one thing to the demand. I am not at all making light of that matter. Government position was carefully set out in that Legislative Session of 1114 in answer to resolutions worded in the large manner in which 3 of these resolutions are worded. The statement made by the Secretary to Government on behalf of Government was amplified and elaborated upon by the Diwan-President.

Mr. Puthur Achyuta Menon (*Kattur*): You have very little to add?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): I was just trying to explain that the resolution of Mr. T. K. Nayar is the logical corollary to the step that has been taken. That cannot be denied. In fact the aspiration of this House for a progressive realisation of this ideal has never escaped the attention of Government at any time. It has made even statutory provision forecasting the demand in the Government of Cochin Act. See section 8. It makes provision for a transfer of other departments also by His Highness at the proper time and when considered opportune. So what I am saying is there is statutory forecast of this inevitable demand, having taken the first step, in the Act itself, where provision has been made for transfer of other departments.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (*Chalakkudi*): Therefore you say that Mr. Nayar's resolution is unnecessary.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): I am saying that whether in its idealistic form or in its practical or limited form in which Mr. Nayar has brought it forward, the aspirations of this House have never escaped the attention of this Government. It has always engaged the attention of Government and will continue to do so. But there is one matter which the House, I respectfully submit, must take into consideration now. Whether in its enlarged form or in its limited form, the demand now made only amounts to an invitation to Government to further emphasise its ultimate object. One thing is forgotten in this connection. The life of this Council has been extended for one year. Therefore the invitation to Government is to make a declaration now in respect of a matter of one year hence. This Council was constituted under a specific set of circumstances and the members were elected on certain conditions then existing. How is it possible to create new Ministers now?

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar (*Cheruthuruthi*): The Government of Cochin Act is there.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): I will explain the matter further. People, who went to the polls and elected a certain number of people and gave them a majority, were under the impression that there will be only one Minister. In the circumstances how can you create half a dozen Ministers without the consent of the people who elected you? I am not making this suggestion without considerable support from some of the hon'ble members themselves.

Mr. A. B. Salem (*Mattancheri*): May I ask a question? When the country went to the polls it was not on the basis of the Government of Cochin Act. Was it not under the old Regulation?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): You are mistaken.

Mr. A. B. Salem (*Mattancheri*): It was only after the election that the Act came into force. The Act came into force on 17th June.

Mr. K. V. Menon (*Publicity Officer*): The announcement was made earlier.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): It only shows that you do not agree with my statement. I do not expect every word of my statement will command your acceptance.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan (*Ezhuvas-Talappalli*): On a point of information, the people expected that Mr. Sivarama Menon will be the Minister and is the Government Secretary of opinion that by his death all the Council members should resign?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): The illustration is so unhappy that even a Government Secretary need not answer it (*Laughter*). We have in our capacity as officials to answer all sorts of questions and suppositions. But this one is so unhappy and inapt that even an official member can decline to answer it.

I was only labouring to make this point clear that, whether in its amplified form or whether in its limited form in which the hon'ble member for Pazhayannur has put it, the subject is one which has always engaged the attention of the Government. It has even made provision for a demand like this under section 8 of the Government of Cochin Act for further transfer of more departments at appropriate and opportune moments. This is hardly the opportune moment, when the term of this Council has been extended by one year. Possibly there are members who would not agree with me. But still I maintain that the electors having gone to the polls upon a given set of circumstances, the proper time for considering this matter would not be this. It will be hardly opportune to consider it or to act upon it at the present moment. I do not stand by myself there. I rely upon the authority of eminent members of this House so far as this argument is concerned. There is another resolution. "This Council recommends to Government that full responsible government be introduced in the State with the beginning of the next Legislative Council". So there are people who think that the tenure of this Legislative Council is not the proper time for the introduction of any further reforms.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar (*Cheruthuruthi*): Is the Government prepared to accept that resolution?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): Are you not tired of that kind of questions? The question is an invitation to Government to declare its immediate policy in regard to the coming Legislative Council. The question is hypothetical.

Mr. T. P. Poulse (*Kanayannur*): Your reply to it will be in the next Legislative Council.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (*Secretary to Government*): I only say that any declaration now made will be out of place. Suppose there is only the above resolution before the House. Then anything which I say now would be only an immediate pronouncement of policy. I am only saying that this is hardly time for the Government

to take action. I am supported in this view by one hon'ble member at least who has tabled that resolution. You may disagree with that hon'ble member also.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar (Nemmara): This is what you call hair splitting.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (Secretary to Government): It is much better than bald arguments. Hair splitting presumes the presence of at least hair, and between bald arguments and hair splitting arguments I prefer the latter. Therefore, the position of the Government is, there is no necessity for an immediate pronouncement upon matters which are properly to be agitated for at a more opportune time. I do not wish to make any further statement.

Mr. Puthur Achyuta Menon (Kattur): Government is not going to make a statement now.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon (Secretary to Government): The Government position is, we feel that the present time is hardly appropriate or opportune for a demand like this. We are supported by one hon'ble member in this position. Otherwise we do not quarrel with the idealistic goal which you have got in view or with the more modified form of progressive realisation which is sought to be mooted in the resolution moved by Mr. T. K. Nayar. That is the position which we now take. Beyond that we have no further desire to take any part in the discussions on this important resolution.

The House rose for the day at 5 p.m.

C. J. MATHEW

Secretary to the Council